View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

Ordinary Mind

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI

ORDINARY THINGS, though they may be called 'constant,'[1] are in fact inconstant, mutually limiting, and contradictory. They do not persist forever. To be "ordinarily existent" means that there must be a profusion of similar things which exist everywhere, and at every time; however, this is not the same as saying that truth is immutable. Ordinary things are things which did not exist at one time but now exist, things which exist now but will later cease to exist. However, that which is *merely* inconstant cannot be said to be in a state of being. In order that things which are in a state of being be in some degree knowable, it is necessary that there be a sense in which they abide without change. Temporally, they must continue without interruption for a certain period of time; spatially, they must occupy a certain place and stay there. In this sense, it must be said that even ordinary things have that constituent character of reality (a "Moment")[2] which is constancy. That is to say, they have the characteristic of maintaining and asserting themselves. No matter what ordinary things are considered, there are none which are without constancy, none which do not maintain themselves. In other words, there are no ordinary things without self-nature.

---

* The original text of this article, *Heijōshin* 平常心 (lit., "quelled or tranquil, constant mind"; here rendered as "ordinary mind"), first published in the *Iwanami-kōza rinrigaku* series (Tokyo, 1941), is found in *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi chosakushū* (Tokyo, 1972), volume 2, pp. 103–128. Footnotes have been provided by the translators, who wish to thank Mr. Steve Antinoff, Prof. Morris J. Augustine, and Ms. Michele Martin for their assistance at various stages of the translation.

[1] *Jō* 常 ("constant") in the expression *heijō no mono* ("ordinary [constant] things"). This expression is used in this article along with several others in a sense which is interchangeable with the term *heijōshin*.

[2] 契機 *keiki*. Japanese rendering of the Hegelian dialectical term *Moment*.

Lacking these conditions, nothing can be said to exist. Even inanimate things, in that they exist, always have constancy. If they did not have constancy, they could not even be perceived. Things which are merely in "flux" cannot be perceived. It is also impossible to know those things which are in flux, while they are in flux, unless the flux is arrested without disturbing the flux. What Bergson calls "intuition" differs from the kind of perception wherein one sees things which are in flux by cutting across the flux and arresting them. Rather, his "intuition" must be taken to mean that one sees things which are in flux by arresting them while they are in flux. To enter the flow and to come to know that flow by flowing together with it, necessarily entails that one enter the flow and arrest it parallel to the direction of the current, rather than across the current. Bergson's intuition, then, involves arresting the flow parallel to the direction of the flow. Without the complete arrest of the flow, there can be no "intuition." The flow, while flowing, must at the same time be in a state of arrest.[3]

It might be supposed that "intuition" means to enter a flow from without and to unite oneself with it. But that which arrests the flow is not something which enters the flow from the outside, and further, intuition must be that which already exists within the flow itself. A flow which does not contain within itself that which arrests is merely a lifeless, *physical* flow. If the flow in question is taken to necessarily mean the *living* flow of life, then intuition must mean that the flow itself has totally arrested itself, while continuing to flow as itself. In other words, that which intuits must not be something which enters the flow from the outside; instead it must have arrested the flow within the flow itself, and done so in complete unity with the flow.

However fast the flow, even if it is so fast that nothing which might be described as the "present" exists, intuition must be that which makes the present be. True flow can be said to mean that there is no present. That a flow-without-present is itself the present is due to the fact that the entire flow is the present. In other words, it is not that the present results from arresting the flow by cutting across the flow and blocking it. Rather, it is that the present resides in the arrest of the flow even as it continues to

---

[3] While the author is here referring to central terms in the philosophy of Bergson which appear in *L'evolution créatrice*, the Buddhist notion of "duration" is no doubt being referred to as well.

flow. Such a "present" is that present which cannot even be called the 'present.' The present of the true flow must be a 'present' in this sense. To restate the matter, it is not that the present is cut off from the past and the future, but that the present must be without *distinction* of past, 'present,' and future. The present must be none other than the time wherein the distinction of before, during, and after has ceased. If the 'present' is grasped only in terms of the common conception of its nature, the perception of that which is in flow is impossible. If, by the perception of flow, one means that that which is in flow is arrested in the 'present,' in the everyday sense, then this kind of perception will end in the negation of the flow, in the annihilation of the flow, and in the failure to perceive the flow. Therefore, in Bergson's "intuition" as well, there must be an arresting. This arresting is an important "Moment" for contemplative perception. When that which arrests remains outside that which is arrested, the result is a duality of perceiving subject and perceived object; when there is, outside that which is arrested, nothing which arrests, the result is a kind of monism.

To continue the discussion in a dialectical frame of reference, there is a sense in which an ordinary thing is a "synthesis." Synthesis, as synthesis, is in any case a unity of contradictions, a quelling of them. Synthesis finds itself when and where its contradictions are quelled; it then is smoothed out, and settles into position. Settled, it becomes quiet. It finds repose, gains constancy, and attains the present. In the present there is stability and composure. Since in ordinariness there is the quality of the present, man, in his ordinariness, can feel at ease and live his life.

In this way, what is ordinary has the nature of synthesis; it is subdued, in a state of arrest, composed, and in a state of undisturbed peace. Herein lies affirmation of the present state of affairs. A sense of security, of and by itself, is an illustration of this "synthesis." Since synthesis is not *en route* toward an end but that end achieved, it must inevitably have an enduring and self-preserving nature. Contradiction is the principle of movement; synthesis is the principle of arrest. Contradiction is insecurity; synthesis is security. The distinctive characteristic of synthesis, as synthesis, is that it demands constancy. This being the case, the nature of synthesis is responsible for the appearance of the craving for an indolent life, optimism, the desire to preserve the *status quo*, peace-at-any-price-ism, mediocrity, banality, and conservative behavior. This is unavoidable, insofar as ordinary things inherently possess the aspect of synthesis. But at the same

time, these attitudes result from mistaking the aspect of synthesis of ordinary things for something eternal.

That man views the world solely in its aspect of "being" or "constancy" is because he erroneously takes the synthetic aspect of ordinary things for something ultimate, or at least for something enduring. In other words, since man assumes anything that 'is' to be ultimate in its existence, in health he forgets disease, in life he forgets death, in peace he forgets war, in order he forgets disorder.

However, an ordinary thing is no mere synthesis; it is antithesis, at the same time. No ordinary thing is, at any moment, without contradiction, in either the horizontal or vertical dimension. A synthesis does not remain as it is, it becomes antithesis. That ordinary things become commonplace, hackneyed, boring, pervaded with mediocrity, and forever stale and without progress, is because they are not merely syntheses but simultaneously antitheses [and antithesis reveals to us the negative aspect of synthesis]. It is because ordinary things ultimately cannot come to arrest in themselves as ultimate synthesis. Contradiction is thus movement and anxiety. It is inconstant and without stability. Because contradiction is without stability, it is said to have no self-nature, to be "non-being," and "emptiness." When only this aspect of ordinary things is perceived, the world will come to be seen as shot through with contradiction, and one cannot but fall into a pessimism which laments the transience of life. In constancy there is nothing to be taken as constant; constancy always confronts its negation. Stability, in and of itself, stares directly into crisis. In this lies the destructive one-sidedness which sees only the contradictory aspect of ordinary things, a perspective brought about by a partial view that takes ordinary things as "non-being."

Man cannot comfortably live in inconstancy. As a consequence of the view which would have it that the world is 'inconstant,' one comes to hate this world of inconstancy and to retire from it. There then arises an idea, typified in the recluse, by which one tries to attain a world of eternal life, lending significance to the inconstant world as a mere process of preparation for the achievement of the eternal realm. This being so, one either views one's life in this world as a temporary stage, or, if the eternal life cannot be admitted as a possibility, one lives in this world by, as it were, resigning oneself to inconstancy, taking it to be one's inexorable fate—there are no other alternatives.

It is wrong to consider ordinary things to be exclusively constant and

"existent" (*u*), but it is also inappropriate to see them as being exclusively inconstant and "non-existent" (*mu*).[4] Ordinary things are at once constant and inconstant, existent and non-existent. Because of his constancy, man has the capacity to feel always at ease; because of his inconstancy, man also feels always anxious. However, anxiety pledges development into further constancy. Thus, the structure of ordinary things is one of constancy which is none other than inconstancy, unity which is none other than contradiction, being which is none other than non-being. Only in this way may we truly understand ordinary things.

The structure of human history can also be understood on the basis of the fact that ordinary things possess the kind of structure just described. If ordinary things were merely "being" (*u*), the movement of history would not materialize, while if they were merely "non-being" (*mu*), the presentness of history would not make itself manifest. It is for this reason that the historical world is said to be being which is none other than non-being, non-being which is none other than being. The necessity for the adoption of the ethical principle that in peace one ought not to forget war, and that in war one ought not to forget peace, finds its basis in the fact that ordinary things are of the same structure.

It is because one must be prepared, so as not to fall into confusion in the face of crisis, that it is said that for man, ordinariness is a matter of great import, or that "everyday life is the very place where the work of redemption is to be carried out."[5] But being genuinely composed and imperturbable in the face of crisis becomes possible when man's ordinariness consists of a synthesis in which all foreseeable and conceivable antitheses are unified. This is ordinariness of the sort which enables one to respond immediately to the various contingencies. It is only by actualizing ordinariness in this sense—the kind of ordinariness that is alert and unbrokenly responsive—that one is able to overcome crisis. Man's ordinariness, whether deep or shallow, is invariably of this character. Because this is so, in responding to the various circumstances of their lives and the facts of their environment, men are able to make everyday decisions and act in the world. And yet, when ordinariness as synthesis lacks greatness and

---

[4] 無 *mu*. In a relative sense in contrast to "being" (有 *u*).

[5] 平生業成 *heizei gōjō*. A term used by the Japanese Pure Land teacher Rennyo (*d.* 1499), to indicate that one attains non-retrogressive conviction in this life that one will realize nirvana in the Pure Land, only with the total acceptance of the truthfulness of the Original Vow of Dharmākara.

depth, the freedom to make decisions and to act in immediate response to circumstances is an impossibility.

An ordinariness which can immediately respond, on encountering the various affairs of daily life, is an "intelligent" ordinariness. Such ordinariness is often witty and intuitive. Keen wits which "see everything at a glance" or reach "accord on the spot" fall into this category.[6] The unhindered freedom exercised in brilliant repartee is also of this type. The lightning quick movements of the masters of the martial arts are not merely "intelligent," but a unity of decision and action; these movements consist in ordinariness as a deep synthesis which is always prepared. The essence of the various traditional arts resides in the fact that at base their ordinariness is comprised of a synthesis in which all the antitheses of the art have been overcome. A master of an art is a person whose ordinariness is of this variety.

The "steady mind"[7] means the moral ordinary mind. It is an unshakeable moral mind which is never lost, no matter what situation is encountered. If morality is not to be limited to a mere equation for moral judgment, such as conscience, but must be considered to include matters of content and substance as well, then the "steady mind" must be an ordinariness in which the intellectual and active faculties have become one. The "steady mind," in that it morally judges and criticizes even the ordinariness of the martial arts and the various other arts, is of the highest order among man's faculties. That it is necessary for man to come to possess the "steady mind" holds true even for masters of the arts.

The way of the samurai (*bushidō*) is perfected through the harmonization of the "steady mind" and the essence of the martial arts. Without this "steady mind," the martial arts easily degenerate into something demonic. The moral aspect of ordinariness must not base itself on naïve, good-natured virtuousness, or other outlooks which have no knowledge of the existence of evil. It must be grounded on a thorough knowledge of all possible forms of evil, and be able to respond promptly in the face of every evil force. Consequently, the moral aspect of ordinariness must be fully tempered by every possible antithesis. In people who are innately good, but go no further, one cannot expect to find this aspect of ordinariness.

---

[6] 一見便見 *ikken benken* and 直下承当 *jikige jōtō*, respectively. Both are commonly used Zen terms.

[7] 恒心 *kōshin*; ch., *heng-hsin*. Cf. Mencius 孟子.

In the everyday 'ordinary (*heijō*) mind,' which we often refer to in ordinary discourse, there is something endowed with the quality of constancy on which we can rest and rely. This constancy, however, not having undergone disciplining, is easily negated. Common sense is also a kind of ordinary constant mind; in our daily lives we tend to depend on it, and it allows us to get along. But, when we encounter an antithesis of any considerable extent, common sense is swiftly negated.

The knowledge of the specialist is such that, within the confines of his particular subject matter, it is not readily negated by antithesis. With regard to their respective arts and techniques, masters and experts have completely overcome all the difficult barriers of antithesis and attained to the wondrous realm of self-autonomous freedom. It is thus, having become the art-itself, that they may be called "incarnations" of their arts. This kind of 'knowing' is different from the scientific knowledge that is spoken of today, resembling, rather, what is called *kotsu* (骨 "knack"; lit., "bone" or "pith") in Japanese. It is said to be something which is suddenly attained and self-acquired; it is not something which can be taught. It is not objective knowledge, but something which might be more appropriately termed "fundamentally subjective knowledge."[1] Furthermore, whereas intuition remains objective and contemplative, *kotsu* is something which is at work, something which is subjective. It is not a 'negative' or passive knowledge that is aware of things external to itself, but knowledge-at-work. *Kotsu* is not a mere intellectual function but a functioning knowledge. It might be termed a positive, active knowledge. In the traditional Japanese arts, there have been, since ancient times, methods of discipline through which this *kotsu* is attained. The original meaning of concepts like "oral transmission" (口伝 *kuden*) or "secret transmission" (秘伝 *hiden*) must reside in the attainment of *kotsu* in this sense.

However accomplished a master of an art may be, he cannot, outside the confines of his art, be considered to have totally overcome all human contradictions, and to have attained total unity. Even a man considered to be an "incarnation" of his particular art cannot be called an unbrokenly

---

[1] 主体的知識 *shutaiteki chishiki*. *Shutai*, which plays a central role in the author's way of thinking, is, in its genuine sense, that which admits of no objectification, the Self to which nothing remains external, for which reason it is translated as "fundamental subject," in distinction to a mere internal subject.

responsive human being. Such a man, though he may not come upon any insurmountable barriers within the domain of his art, may well, in the total, living matter of his human existence, encounter unanticipated barriers of this kind. In other words, antitheses still remain and contradictions are left unresolved. Hence it is that one must become an accomplished master in the total, living matter of human existence.

A man of moral virtue more than a master of an art, and a man of philosophy or a man of religion more than a man of moral virtue, are fully concerned with the total, living matter of being human. Scholars of ethics, philosophy, and religion are also concerned with the question of man in general, and while the expression of that concern runs the gamut from the scientific-objective to a standpoint which is philosophic and oriented toward human life, it is the latter which must constitute the essential approach. It is not the objective and impartial study of ethical, philosophical, or religious phenomena, but gaining knowledge of how to "*live*" morality, philosophy, or religion, that must be the essential concern. Gaining knowledge of how to *live* in a total way must be the essential concern.

One who makes an objective study of how to live in a total manner lives his life while viewing it from the outside; there is not, on his part, the slightest "application" (工夫 *kufū*) in living, no tempering or practicing of what it is to live. This kind of scholar does not make the living of a total life his essential concern. It is an approach which is exemplified by scholars of ethics who do not necessarily have a deep concern about how to *live* morality. They think that the living of morality is one thing, and the study of ethics quite another. They further think that the essential task for the scholar of ethics is the objective and impartial treatment of ethical concerns. Contemporary scholarship in ethics is of this sort, and certainly this approach is not only possible but acceptable as well. Nevertheless, when it comes to the scholarly investigation of ethics, or the question of ethical knowledge, must it not be more essential to acquire a *living* knowledge of how to put ethics into practice—a knowledge only to be acquired through *living* the life of ethics? Must the true student of ethics not be one who strives to gain or has attained such a *living* knowledge?

The modern, Western-style academic discipline of ethics has driven this traditional approach to the "learning" of ethics out of the world of legitimate studies, thus bringing about the decline and annihilation of the latter. This traditional approach to ethical knowledge and the study

of ethics involves a subjective knowledge of ethics (it can even be called "fundamentally subjective ethics"), and thus differs, in both meaning and methodology, from the modern, Western-style scholarship, in which knowledge of ethics is sought objectively and impartially. In the East, this "fundamentally subjective ethics" is to be found in the "learning" of ethics and the striving to "know" morality. As a mode of ethical knowledge, it must be said that "fundamentally subjective ethics" is far more essential than the Western-style approach.

The Confucian *Analects*, for example, is a work which expresses a fundamentally subjective knowledge of ethics, and is indeed an example of "fundamentally subjective knowledge." "Fundamentally subjective ethics" does not attempt to clarify the essential meaning of ethics through an objective and impartial knowing of ethics; it is rather a living, working, "fundamentally subjective knowledge" which *lives* ethics. The essence of that kind of ethics which is acquired through objective, impartial study is not a living, working knowledge, but a merely objective one. Scholars of ethics do not, by knowing this essence, become ethical. The true essence of ethics must be of such a nature that when one knows it, the knower immediately becomes ethical. To know this living, working essence of ethics must be the purpose of "fundamentally subjective ethics." It is only through the *living* of ethics that this approach to the study of ethics is actualized. And it is only through moral discipline that this study progresses. Otherwise, however painstakingly one investigates ethics in an objective and impartial manner, however precisely one may come to know the essence of ethics in this sense, it will remain impossible to gain even the slightest fundamentally subjective knowledge of morality. For this reason, it is conceivable that even the best scholar of ethics in the Western sense may be a poor scholar of Eastern ethics.

In the East, the primary meaning of "learning" or "knowing" does not reside in the acquisition of objective and impartial knowledge, but in gaining fundamentally subjective knowledge. The Japanese awareness of the nature of Western-style ethics is by no means a recent development, but even today people ridicule a scholar of ethics who is immoral, or consider his life to be a contradiction. This is because of the time-honored view of "knowing" in the East, which holds that the act of knowing should be fundamentally subjective. From the standpoint of humanity, it can hardly be permissible for a scholar of ethics to be immoral. And yet, considered merely as a 'scholar' of ethics, a man's being immoral need not

be at all in conflict with his professional expertise. When the matter is viewed in this manner, a feeling of incongruity would be out of place. Nevertheless, if the primary aim of "learning" ethics must in fact be the attainment of fundamentally subjective knowledge, that anyone with even the slightest claim to be a scholar of ethics, whether in the Western style or otherwise, should neglect to undertake to obtain fundamentally subjective knowledge—this can hardly but seem an incongruity.

From the outset one must fully recognize that Western-style ethics, while derived from merely intellectual rather than moral imperatives, has greatly contributed to the so-called academic world and also has indirectly proved useful to morality itself. And yet, it must be said that for man fundamentally subjective knowledge occupies a superior position. Insofar as merely objective knowledge is concerned, the study of morality and the study of art are of equal import; there is no reason whatsoever why, for man, the scholarly investigation of morality should be rated above the investigation of art. From this standpoint, knowledge which is objectively valid is superior in rank. That the study of morality is placed higher than the study of art is because, when the study of the former is subjective, the living knowledge which enables one to *live* morality is superior, from the point of view of man, to that which enables one to *live* art. In other words, the study of morality is to be ranked above the study of art only in cases wherein the former is rooted in fundamentally subjective knowledge.

Fundamentally subjective ethics perhaps tends to be identified with practical ethics, but contemporary practical ethics is comprised solely of objective knowledge, being devoid of the subjective. More than is true of one who is only a scholar of ethics, the scholar of practical ethics might be expected to *live* ethics himself, or at least to have deep concern with what it means to *live* ethics. And yet, the pursuit of the study of practical ethics does not mean that one will practice ethics, nor does it mean one will gain fundamentally subjective knowledge for that practice. On the contrary, the study of practical ethics lacks the slightest concern with the actual *living* of ethics. It is no more than a field of study which concerns itself with learning *about* what it would be to *live* ethics. In his academic endeavors, the scholar of practical ethics does not practice morality in the least. Consequently, practical ethics belongs to a completely different category than fundamentally subjective ethics. The study of morality in the Western sense differs completely from what has been referred to in the East, since ancient times, as "learning the Way" (道を学ぶ *michi o manabu*

or 学道 *gakudō*). Therefore, progress in the study of morality does not directly bring about progress in morality itself. A scholar of ethics, however excellent he may be as such, will not for that reason see the appraisal of his moral being rise even an inch.

The contemporary academic fields of philosophy and religion are, in this regard, no different from the study of ethics. They fall into the same category. Philosophy and religion must, from their essential nature, make their primary aim the actualization of man's total, vital, fundamentally subjective, and ultimate unity. In other words, their aim must be that the fundamental subjectivity of man should come to be the totally and ultimately unified self. To *live* philosophy or to *live* religion, in the root sense, must mean that man achieves an ultimate unity of self, in a fundamentally subjective manner. That is, man must achieve his ultimately unified, fundamental subjectivity. Herein lies the reason that *living* philosophy, or *living* religion, is the highest and most critical matter for man. Should philosophy itself, as is the case with those contemporary academic disciplines which are classified as sub-divisions of philosophy—the philosophy of nature, the philosophy of mathematics, epistemology, moral philosophy, aesthetics, the philosophy of religion, social philosophy, the philosophy of history, etc.—remain an attempt to comprehend the myriad discrete phenomena on the basis of the so-called academic imperatives, then, even though this effort may be undertaken by means of a basic method which is specifically called 'philosophical,' philosophy will not function in a fundamentally subjective manner to make of man an ultimate unity. Furthermore, if philosophy does not concern itself with the realization of this unity of man, or, what is worse, should it fail to *even* treat this problem objectively, then philosophy will be only a particular and intellectual concern, though it may be a basic one. Philosophy in this sense, one would be compelled to say, is not worthy of being taken up as the highest and most critical concern for man.

The original concern of philosophy is not merely a matter of intellectually investigating particular phenomena, basic as that investigation may be. It must entail elucidating the total being in a total manner. By elucidating in a total manner is meant, not a merely intellectual elucidation, but rather an elucidation in which the whole draws together, becoming one, and operates as one body and with full force. The elucidating function is not merely an intellectual one; it is a function in which the totality works as one body. It is the total function of the total being. It is a working

in which all the functions come together and converge on the point of their working. That the total being works in this way to elucidate its total self—this is what is meant by elucidating in a total manner. The essential elucidation of philosophy must be this kind of total elucidation. The original "task" of philosophy must be a total task which the total being imposes on itself, not a merely intellectual task. Elucidating this total "task" in a total manner, by means of the total function of the elucidator, must constitute the essential work of philosophy.

To *live* philosophy in this manner is no mere intellectual affair. It must consist in man's attempt to live ultimately. The term "elucidating in a total manner" means nothing other than to live ultimately. For this reason, to *live* philosophy is not just a matter of *sapientia* (knowledge). It must be that which constitutes the concern of a (true) *sapiens-faber*.[9] What is generally referred to as "the philosophy of human life" or "life philosophy"[10] sets out to elucidate, not particular phenomena, but the totality of human life. At present, however, this philosophical approach is largely made up of concerns which are merely intellectual. Its task is not a total task, nor is the function which elucidates this task a total function. The elucidation is therefore not a total elucidation.

The "task" of philosophy is a total one, and one which the total being imposes on itself. This must mean, not that the total being takes up as its task something other than itself, but that it takes up itself as its task. Most emphatically stated, the task of philosophy lies "directly beneath one's feet."[11] In other words, the total being itself *is* the task. That the total being, which is itself the task, elucidates itself in a total manner by means of itself, is to *live* philosophy. That which is elucidated and that which elucidates are here neither one nor different. That which elucidates, in and through its elucidation of the task, elucidates itself. Through the elucidation of the task, that which elucidates is elucidated. Moreover, the one who *lives* philosophy in this sense, if, for example, it is 'I' who is doing

---

[9] That is, "not just a matter of understanding (*sapientia*), but of both understanding (*sapiens*) and working (*faber*) at the same time."

[10] 人生哲学 *jinsei tetsugaku* and 生命哲学 *seimei tetsugaku*, respectively; the author refers to Dilthey's *Philosophie des Lebens* below.

[11] 脚跟下 *kyakkon ka*. Zen term for the true Self. In Buddhist scriptures an awakened one is said to manifest thirty-two excellent physical marks, one of which is "feet standing firm and even."

the *living* of philosophy, is none other than 'I' myself. It is not something which is separate from 'I', not something which transcends 'I', and not something which is immanent in 'I'.

When it is said that the total being, which is itself the task, elucidates itself in a total manner by means of itself, this may sound like Hegelian dialectical thought. While the term "total being" as it is used here may be taken to mean something like "Idea" (*Idee*), the "Idea" is not the dialectical philosopher himself. The Idea is something the dialectical philosopher grasps as the principle of the world. The dialectical philosopher who grasps this Idea is not himself that Idea. Herein resides the reason why dialectical philosophy differs from the kind of philosophy being advanced here.

When only the "Idea" develops dialectically, the dialectical philosopher himself does not develop together with it in a total manner. The philosopher merely grasps the Idea as an object, or, in order to grasp it, speculates dialectically. For this reason, one who undertakes philosophy dialectically does not, through that undertaking itself, elucidate himself totally and in a fundamentally subjective way. On the contrary, for the dialectical philosopher, philosophy may be quite different from this kind of self-elucidation. However, for man in his totality, the total and fundamentally subjective elucidation of the self ought to be, even for a pre-eminent dialectical philosopher, a far more important concern.

If, in order to be consistent with the use of the term "fundamentally subjective ethics," we single out the philosophy described here as "fundamentally subjective philosophy," this latter is eminently religious and adapted to practice. That philosophy must be the ultimate concern of man is because philosophy is the fundamentally subjective, ultimate unity for man. And yet, what is today called philosophy is not at all like this. Philosophy does not even concern itself with this matter of man's ultimate unity, and this must be said to drag philosophy down from its original rank of ultimacy and to deprive it of its primary significance. Today philosophy has so far departed from its primary area of concern that few people, including the philosophers, feel it strange that those who are called philosophers do not attain to a total, fundamentally subjective unity of self, and in fact do not even undertake the attempt to attain to it. If one attributes this to a change in man's conception of philosophy, that is true as far as it goes, but no matter how much this conception may change, there is no altering the fact that the ultimate concern for man must be the

attainment of fundamentally subjective, ultimate unity. It must be the *living* of philosophy in a fundamentally subjective manner.

Oriental philosophies, such as those of the Four Confucian Classics, Lao-tzu, and Sung dynasty Confucianism, as well as Buddhist philosophy, are all fundamentally subjective. To study in an ultimate manner means to attain to the unity of oneself in a fundamentally subjective, ultimate way. One who has not attained to the unity of self in a fundamentally subjective, ultimate way cannot be said to have studied ultimately. In the East, the primary significance of study, whether in the arts, in morality, or in these philosophies, is fundamentally subjective. Moreover, philosophy must rank highest among man's fundamentally subjective studies. To "*learn* of man" or to "*learn* of human life" means that the one who "learns" makes it his highest aim to totally and ultimately attain to a unity of self. Apart from this, there is no "*learning* of human life."

To "*know* human life" consists in nothing other than attaining to the unity of self in a total and ultimate manner. This is total, fundamentally subjective "knowledge." It is neither mere objective knowledge nor mere intellectual function. The elucidation of the total "task" in a total manner is itself total, fundamentally subjective knowledge. The re-living of a "lived experience," as advocated in the philosophy of life (*Philosophie des Lebens*) of Wilhelm Dilthey and others,[12] remains only an objective knowledge of life. However concretely the essence of life may be grasped through the re-living of a "lived experience," that essence is in the end only objective, not subjective. The fundamentally subjective essence of life is not something which may be attained by re-living a "lived experience"; it must be attained by the living of life itself. Needless to say, though this essence of life may be attainable, it is not something which can be attained objectively.

The essence of life is not the re-living of a "lived experience" as something objective. It consists in living life in a fundamentally subjective manner. To "*live* philosophy" in a fundamentally subjective manner does not mean to re-live lived experience. It must mean nothing other than to live a unified and fundamentally subjective life. To "*learn* life" or to "*know* life" in a fundamentally subjective manner, entails overcoming not only intellectual contradictions, but overcoming the total contradiction

[12] Dilthey, Ernst Troeltsch, Eduard Spranger, and so on in Germany; Bergson and those influenced by him in France.

of life in a total manner. Consequently, living is knowing and knowing is living. This, of course, does not mean 'knowing' in the sense that living beings ordinarily know themselves, that is, in the sense of self-awareness. If the proposition were to be interpreted in that way, living beings would only know reflectively and objectively about the living of life. This would not be the kind of knowledge which works in a fundamentally subjective and total manner to *live* life, having overcome the contradiction of life. Bergson's "intuition" is also objective, not subjective, because he means by "intuition" to know the concrete forms of life while flowing alongside life.

It would seem that both modern Western philosophy, and also contemporary philosophy in Japan, which has been influenced by the West, are too partial to strictly intellectual concerns. The problems of philosophy are too disparate and departmentalized; the original, primary significance of philosophy appears to be too often neglected. Herein lies the reason why in the West as well, men must reflect on ancient and medieval philosophy, and particularly on the time-honored, fundamentally subjective philosophy of the East. Again, for the same reason, it must be demanded of the philosopher that he be something of a sage.

The study of religion is now encountering the same problems; not only the study of religion as an empirical science, but even its study as a philosophical undertaking, are nothing more than an effort to know religion in a merely objective way. At present, the same is true of the study of Buddhism. The study of Buddhism as it is currently conducted, no matter how impartial and discerning it may be, is not such that the undertaking of scholarship means "*living* a Buddhist life." To gain knowledge of Buddhism through studies of this sort is one thing, while to *live* a Buddhist life is quite another. This kind of knowledge of Buddhism, although it involves a 'knowing' of Buddhism (in the objective sense), is not a knowledge which leads to the *living* of a Buddhist life. This cannot be the essential meaning of what it is to "*know*" Buddhism.

To "*know*" Buddhism must mean to live a Buddhist life. To *know* Buddhism must mean to know Buddhism in a fundamentally subjective manner. Furthermore, to *know* Buddhism in a fundamentally subjective manner must be grounded in man's attempt to elucidate himself in a total and fundamentally subjective manner. The essential meaning of "learning" Buddhism is to *know* Buddhism in a fundamentally subjective manner.

It is said that contemporary Buddhist studies have broken new ground, but this has completely failed to serve man in a Buddhist way, and what

is more, as a consequence of this development Buddhism is in the process of being turned into something anachronistic and dead. This decline stems from the fact that the way in which Buddhism is being 'learned' is not fundamentally subjective. If in the Buddhist world the meaning of "*learning* Buddhism" comes generally to be taken in the modern academic sense, Buddhism will surely perish. If no one attempts to *know* Buddhism in a fundamentally subjective manner, as is already the case in the Buddhist world, then Buddhism will in all probability lose its essential life. For fear that "learning" Buddhism might fall into this kind of deluded understanding, and thus turn away from the essence of Buddhism, the ancient Buddhist sages strongly warned against the academic apprehension of Buddhism. The rise of Zen in China, with the expression, "Not relying on words or letters,/ An independent Self-transmitting apart from any teaching,"[13] in particular, as its banner, can be looked upon as a form of self-criticism carried on within Buddhism itself. This criticism taught that one should forsake the fetters of the all-pervasive academic approach that was predominant at the time, in favor of returning to the fundamentally subjective knowledge that is the original essence of Buddhism.

Learning Buddhism has at present completely degenerated into academic understanding, to the extent that the 'knowing' involved is merely objective. There is reason to fear that even Zen will degenerate into an academic understanding of the *Shōbōgenzō*, and fall into an understanding of the koan that is simply intellectual. Insofar as 'learning' Buddhism does not turn away from academic understanding and objective study in the Western style, to return to fundamentally subjective study, there can be no realization of the true knowledge that is the essence of Buddhism. So long as this change does not occur, Buddhism will not come back to life.

A man who has fundamentally subjective knowledge is not simply *sapiens* (knowing person) but, at the same time, *faber* (worker). Fundamentally subjective knowledge is not merely an intellectual activity in the narrow sense, but a knowledge that lives and works in a total, fundamentally subjective manner. With this knowledge, to work in a total and vital way is completely one with knowing in a total and vital manner. To work is to know; to know is not to know something. To know and to work are not separate. It is neither the case that after having come to

[13] Cf. the author's "Zen: Its Meaning for Modern Civilization," *EB* 1, 1 (1965), pp. 22–47.

know, one works, nor that after having come to engage in work, one knows. To work is knowledge. And yet, this does not refer to an intellectual function in the narrow sense. Rather it means to be *sapiens* and, at the same time, to be *faber*.

Those who are known as masters in the various traditional arts are men of an unhindered freedom in whom knowledge and work are one. Their work is knowledge and their knowledge is work. When it is said of a master that he "*knows*" his art, this means, not that he knows his art objectively, as though it were an academic pursuit, but that he "*works*" in his art. Masters of the arts are sometimes said to be incarnations of their arts, and an incarnation of an art is none other than the essence of that art. For a master to attain the essence of his art is one thing, while for a scholar to grasp the essence of that art is quite another. Even if a scholar grasps the essence of an art, he cannot *work* in that art, but when a master attains the essence of his art he can work in that art in unhindered freedom. *Working* knowledge is of the quality of *faber*. It is only through knowledge of the *faber* variety that we can hope for progress and creation in the various arts.

The masters of the various arts have attained fundamentally subjective knowledge in their respective arts, yet they cannot be said to have ultimate, unified, fundamentally subjective knowledge. Those who are called saints and sages, however, have this latter kind of knowledge. Saints and sages are not simply men who have attained to the mastery of some particular art, but men who have attained to the Great Way of humanity, men who have realized the essence of what it means to be human. Although one speaks of masters of the various arts, one does not refer to saints and sages of particular arts. This is because when one speaks of saints and sages one does so in terms of man in his totality. The word 'saint' has still a moral ring to it, and the word 'sage' still carries the implications of *sapiens*. A man who has attained ultimate, unified, fundamentally subjective knowledge is, however, neither a merely moral man, nor merely a man of *sapientia*. He is a total man, *sapiens-faber*.

If the appellation "a man of attainment" (達人 *tatsujin*) is employed, not in terms of the 'ways' of the various arts, such as the 'way' of swordsmanship, but in terms of man in his totality, then this expression would seem to be best suited to the total man of *sapiens-faber*. It is only in this kind of "man of attainment" that the true ordinary mind is found. The ordinary mind must be total, unified, fundamentally subjective knowl-

edge. In other words, it must be a fundamental subject which is the whole actualization of total, ultimate unity.

When the venerable Zen master Nan-ch'üan, well known in connection with the ancient case concerning the killing of a cat,[14] was confronted by his disciple Chao-chou, who is renowned for his role in the koan about whether a dog has the Buddha-nature,[15] with the sudden question, "What is the Way?," Nan-ch'üan effortlessly responded, "Ordinary Mind is the Way."[16] This answer of Nan-ch'üan's has become very famous. The Way

[14] Nan-ch'üan P'u-yüan (j., Nansen Fugan; *d.* 835). The killing of the cat is found in *Chao-chou lu* (j., *Jōshū roku*, "The Record of Chao-chou"), no. 6 (cf. Akizuki Ryōmin's edition, Chikuma shobō, 1973) and *Wu-men-kuan* (j., *Mumon kan*, "The Gateless Barrier"), no. 14.

[15] Chao-chou Ts'ung-shen (j., Jōshū Jūshin; *d.* 897). Cf. *Chao-chou lu*, no. 132, and *Wu-men-kuan*, no. 1.

[16] 平常心是道 *heijōshin zedō*. The Zen master Ma-tsu Tao-i (j., Baso Dōitsu; *d.* 788) uses the term *heijōshin* in its original sense in which it is contrasted with *shōjishin* 生死心 ("life-death mind"). "[Ma-tsu said:] 'The Way does not require practice to attain to it. Only do not contaminate it. What is meant by contamination? [It means] only that there is the life-death mind which seeks—this constitutes contamination. Let me tell you, if you directly realize this Way, you will know that it is none other than ordinary (tranquil and constant) mind. What do I mean by ordinary (tranquil and constant) mind? It is our being free from "making," free from right and wrong, free from "take" and "forsake," free from annihilation and eternity, free from unawakened and awakened. The scripture (Vimalakīrti nirdeśa) states, "That which is neither the practice of the unawakened one nor of the awakened one, that is the practice of the bodhisattva." Our present walking, staying, sitting, and lying, every response to opportunities, and contact with others—these are all the Way. The Way is the dharma-world. The wondrous functionings of the awakened one which are as innumerable as the grains of sands of the [Ganges] River do not go beyond the range of the dharma-world. . . . All our walking-staying-sitting-lying are so many functionings that go beyond thought" *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (*Keitoku dentō roku*, "The Transmission of the Lamp"), *ch.* 28. With both Ma-tsu and Nan-ch'üan, *heijōshin* means the Ordinary Mind awakened to its true Self and functioning in its everyday activities—that is, what the author calls the creation of Suprahistorical history. (Cf. *Chao-chou lu*, no. 1: "On another day the Master (Chao-chou) asked his master Nan-ch'üan, 'What is the Way?' Nan-ch'üan said: 'Ordinary (tranquil and constant) mind is the Way.' The Master asked: 'Can one go after it?' Nan-ch'üan said: 'If you seek after it, you immediately fall away from it.' The Master said: 'If you do not even seek, how could you know that that is the Way?' Nan-ch'üan said: 'The Way does not belong to knowing or to not knowing. Knowing is a delusion; not knowing is merely the temporary suspension of delusive knowing. Once you really attain to this, the Way that is free from doubt is like the great void—vast, empty, open. How can it be that one should discriminate this from that?' Upon this the Master immediately realized the truth, his mind like a bright moon.")

referred to here is the Great Way of man, the unsurpassable Way, the Way which mankind should tread and practice. In Buddhism this is also called "Unsurpassed Right Awakening."[17] A scholarly master of scriptural teachings could not definitively answer this question about the Way, even if he were to use millions of words. To this searching question with which he was faced, Nan-ch'üan's answer is in effect, "When hungry, I eat; when tired, I sleep." In this there is indication of a truly unhindered, Self-abiding realm which only a "man of attainment" can reach.

When Chao-chou, who had posed this question to Nan-ch'üan, was in turn asked by a monk, "What is the Way?," he parried by saying, "That which is outside the wall."[18] I wonder if he did not mean by this that there was a "highway" outside the wall. Indeed, it would have to be said that this expresses a wondrous mode of existence attained by the fundamental subject, a mode of existence which stretches in all directions and to which nothing in the world is external.

Usually, the "Way" is thought of as being a "norm" or a "principle" for man to follow, or understood to mean "form," as opposed to "matter." Considered from the standpoint of Idealism, categories such as norm and form are transcendent; they are principles with which matter accords itself. Form and matter are neither identical nor separate, and in the actual world they never completely become one. It is thought that without the combination of form and matter there cannot be anything actual, but this is not to say that form and matter are completely unified. That which is actual is neither pure form nor pure matter. Form always transcends matter, and matter follows form. That which is actual is thought to be involved in an endless process of approaching pure form.

In the philosophy of value, "form" is only a norm used in arriving at value judgments, but in the philosophy of history form is something dynamic, something which enables history to develop—it is the beginning and the end of history. Whether form is viewed to be static, as in the

---

[17] Sk., *anuttara-samyak-sambodhi*. What the author means is that awakening is at once Self and the Way by which the Self lives.

[18] 墻外底 *shōgotsi*. From *Chao-chou lu*, no. 335: "A questioner asked: 'What is the Way?' The Master [Chao-chou] said: 'That which is outside the wall.' The questioner: 'I'm not inquiring about that.' The Master said: 'Which Way are you asking about, then?' The questioner: 'The Great Way.' The Master said: 'The Great Way leads to Ch'ang-an.'" Also, *ibid.*, no. 963: "A questioner: 'Can a dog have the awakened Self-nature?' The Master said: 'The front of each house leads to Ch'ang-an.'"

philosophy of value, or viewed to be dynamic, as in the philosophy of history, it is after all transcendent and of the nature of an object; it is not fundamentally subjective in the sense that the term has been used in this paper. In the case where history is viewed as the development of form itself, form is considered to be immanent and subjective, but insofar as form is not a total actualization of itself, form is not fundamentally subjective in the sense that is intended here. Anything like the total actualization of form itself is impossible for form as it is ordinarily conceived, that is, for form as the 'subject' of history.

The reason why form is considered the 'subject' in the philosophy of history is because the immanent aspect of form—form as a necessary "Moment" in the structure of that which is historically actual—is made absolute. In other words, the Idea, in Plato, is considered to be originally transcendent and otherworldly, but that which is actual necessarily partakes of the Idea. When the Idea, which is thus embodied in the actual, is made absolute in its immanence, and history is interpreted as its development, there arises the notion of an immanent, developing Idea. However, even if form is considered, in this way, to be immanent and 'subjective,' since form itself does not achieve total actualization of itself, it is not fundamentally subjective in my sense of the term.

The actualization of "form" is always self-limiting and finite. Form is experienced only in its self-limitation. It is said that form is only actualized as that which is actual in history. And yet it is thought that while form, through its actualization in history, limits itself and becomes finite, at the same time it transcends actuality and, being infinite, cuts off limitation. Only when form is taken in this sense can it be the form which is the subject of history.

That which is actual is said to be a combination of form and matter, but when this question is considered from the standpoint of form as the subject of history, that which is actual constitutes the self-limitation of form. Though when form and matter are considered dualistically the two come to be combined, in the dynamic monism of form matter serves as the medium for the actualization of form.[19] In Plato's thought, actuality has only a passive role with respect to form. From the standpoint of form, actuality is only to be negated. There is no positive, affirmative reason why form must combine with matter.

---

[19] As with Aristotle and Hegel.

In the philosophy of history, on the other hand, "form" actualizes itself only through its combination with matter, that is, only through self-limitation. Self-limitation, therefore, is the necessary self-development or self-actualization of form. In this view, "matter" comes to be seen as something positive and affirmative. Consequently, the act of self-limitation on the part of form, or its combining itself with matter, does not represent the corruption of form. Rather, this must be regarded as the expression of the essence of form. Only form in this sense can affirm history and constitute the principle which makes history possible.

The terms "absolute nothingness" and "absolute negation" are, in the philosophy of history, synonymous with "form" as it has just been described. Form, through self-limitation, actualizes itself. However, while this kind of limitation of form constitutes the establishment and affirmation of what is actual, at the same time it must be the negation of what is actual, that is, the negation of the limited self. It is in the limitation of the self and, moreover, in the infinite negation of what is limited, that there is found the absolutely negative character of form, or its character of "absolute nothingness" (絶対無 *zettai mu*), which constitutes the principle of history.

If reality, which is the self-limitation of form, is understood as affirmation or "being," then this affirmation or "being" will be unable, within history, to abide as such. Were affirmation, or "being," to abide, there would be no history. These, however, undergo negation, and in this there is found the meaning of form as absolute nothingness. Being, while it is the self-limitation of absolute nothingness, is also, insofar as it must be negated, "non-being." It is in this sense that that which is actual in history is said to be being which is none other than non-being. In this respect, in the philosophy of history, as compared to Platonic philosophy, terminology is employed with the opposite meaning. For Plato, form is being and matter is non-being.

"Form," as the term is used in the philosophy of history—or the "absolute nothingness" which functions as the principle of history—is not completely other-worldly and objective, external and transcendent, as is the case with an ideal or a merely conceptual goal that is to be sought after, whether this goal or ideal be mutable or immutable in the realm of eternity. Rather, form in this sense, or, alternatively, "absolute nothingness," lies at the base of that which is actual in history, "*lives* in history," and itself constitutes the immanent subject of history. Furthermore, this

subject of history, in that it eternally creates that which is historically actual, is "absolute being" and of immanent character, but at the same time, in that it eternally negates its self-limitation, it is "absolute nothingness" and of external and transcendent character. In this, form and matter are not dualistic. The self-limiting aspect of the subject which lives history is matter; the negating aspect of self-limitation is form. That the historically actual is negation which is none other than affirmation, is because the subject which *lives* in history is possessed of this kind of structure.

That which is historically actual does not come into being through the combination of form and matter. Rather, that which is actual is of the character of negation that is none other than affirmation, and hence, 'form' and 'matter' are only dualistic abstractions. Form and matter as the "Momente" of history are not dual entities. They are none other than the dynamic and reciprocal aspect of the subject of history. Through self-limitation, the subject of history expresses itself and transforms itself into "being." By negating that which has been transformed into being, it comes to acquire the creative character of self-limitation. If the subject of history were fixed as some particular being, its self-limitation would become deterministic, and its creativity in history could not but be annihilated. That history is infinitely creating is due to the fact that absolute nothingness is the subject of history. In this fact that the subject of history is absolute nothingness resides the freedom of historical form from determinism.

The view that form is indeterminate may seem to be opposed to the predominant thinking of Greek philosophy concerning form, but the view that looks on form as something determinate results from partial observation which sees only the self-limiting aspect of form and overlooks the negating aspect of self-limitation. If form is regarded as something determined, its self-limitation would result in the negation of form, without giving form any affirmative expression. History, in this event, could not but become something negative. In the Platonic view of actuality or in certain kinds of religious world views, in which the historical world is regarded as a degenerate world, or as a lower world, there is a preponderance of thought which is based upon a deterministic view of form, or of a view of form as something external and transcendent. This view of form, however, is not only incapable of explaining history, it finally negates our historical life, and is unable to give any positive meaning to it.

If it is given that one cannot leave the historical world even for a moment, or even take a single step away from it, ordinariness must mean the daily actuality of the historical world. It goes without saying that even should one consider a life after death which is temporally remote from actuality, or a heavenly beyond separated spatially from this world, these cannot be called ordinariness. Even in the historical world, an external, transcendent form or ideal cannot be called ordinariness. All of these, on the contrary, are distantly removed from ordinariness, and furthermore, will always lie beyond the reach of ordinariness. Thus, ordinariness must mean the everyday actuality of the historical world. But how is it that this daily actuality of the historical world can be called the "Way," as Nan-ch'üan did?

As was mentioned above, if it were a 'form' or a 'norm' that is meant by the "Way," then something which is external and transcendent, and is removed from everyday actuality, would, conversely, constitute the "Way." In this case, ordinariness would be something which ought to accord itself with the Way, and, at times, something which would even oppose itself to the Way. Ordinariness taken in this sense would inevitably come to mean something that cannot possibly be called the Way. How is it, then, that ordinariness is the "Way"?

If, as Nan-ch'üan said, ordinariness must indeed be the Way, the Way cannot be of the nature of a transcendental form or norm to which ordinariness ought to accord itself. Instead, it must be that in the Way, the everyday actuality of history is none other than the form of history. In other words, ordinariness does not mean "ordinary existence" which accords itself with form. "Form" must be taken to mean that kind of form which does not hold outside itself the ordinary existence that is in accord with it. However, this does not mean that a certain everyday actuality in history serves as the norm for some other actuality. Rather, it must be that everyday actuality itself, in and of itself, is the norm. The assertion that ordinariness itself is the norm does not indicate that this ordinary existence constitutes the norm for some other thing. It is instead that ordinary existence and the norm are one and the same.

Everyday actuality is not a stage in the process of the realization of an ideal, or a means directed toward an end. Everyday actuality itself, in and of itself, is the ideal, the end. This is not mere realism or naturalism. It is of the nature that, "each and every being is perfect as it is," and that,

"between particulars there is no obstruction."[20] But is it not conceivable that people will assume that this view of reality is only possible with "form," as it was explained above, as the subject in history?

Indeed, with form as the subject in history, to *live* in history is itself the aim and the ideal, and thus it may be that the everyday actuality of history itself comes to be thought of as the Way. However, when this matter is more carefully considered, it is apparent that 'form as the subject in history,' in the sense that the expression is used here, is none other than a principle which affirms the historical world of actuality *as it is* as a given, and which elucidates in a philosophical and fundamental manner how this affirmation is possible. Even if this principle is one in which the coming into being of history-as-a-given is elucidated, it is not a principle which enables the criticism of history-as-a-given itself, nor is it a principle which affirms or negates history-as-a-given in principle.

This means only that history as it is given can best be elucidated from a standpoint such as that of subjective form. It cannot be the concern of this subjective form whether or not that history-as-a-given, which can be elucidated by subjective form, is after all capable of being ultimately supported as itself. Neither, accordingly, can this matter be at all a concern of the philosophy of history, which takes as its purpose only the elucidation of history-as-a-given. The problem here is that of whether the support of history itself is possible, and this problem must be one which goes beyond the bounds of the philosophy of history. The religious view of history arises when the sharp scalpel of criticism is applied to the question of whether history itself *can* after all be ultimately supported as itself. Religion does not take the position that history is everything, or that history is central. That man has religion is proof in itself that he is not satisfied with the view that history is everything, or that it is central.

It is with history as a basis that the particular actualities of history criticize other particular actualities. However, the criticism by history of history itself is not a matter of history. History holds within itself the criticizing of history itself. In this respect, history itself denies, from the outset, that history is everything, or that it is central. This criticizing of

---

[20] 個個円成 *kokoenjō* and 事事無礙 *jijimuge*, respectively. The former is Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in's (j., Engo Kokugon; *d.* 1135) comment in *Pi-yen lu* (j., *Hekigan roku*; "Blue Cliff Records"), no. 62; the latter is a term from Hua-yen Buddhism.

history itself reveals the contradictory movement which is contained in the foundation of history. This is the movement wherein history ultimately negates itself.

It has already been mentioned that, as history is not merely an affirmation but at the same time a negation, there is necessarily within history a negating "Moment" which negates history itself. This negating "Moment" is at the same time affirmative and causes history to arise. It is not a contradictory movement which criticizes history itself and is the complete reverse of the direction of history. When in the course of history great obstacles are encountered and history comes to a 'standstill,' confronting crisis, it is thought that history becomes negative. However, in this understanding, no matter how grave the crisis may be, the result will be no more than a criticism of particular historical actualities or situations, and not a criticism of history itself. Such a grave crisis may on the contrary be thought of as a "Moment" leading to an even greater affirmation of history.

The criticism of history itself is not something which arises as a particular actuality or event in the course of this historical process. It is conceived, rather, deep in the womb of history itself, and has been so from the beginning. In other words, the very fact that history is history makes it necessary that history criticize itself. History is history in that it is contradiction which is none other than unity, non-being which is none other than being, inconstancy which is none other than constancy, anxiety which is none other than tranquillity. It is only as something of this nature that history is possible; it is because history is of this nature that it must criticize itself and negate itself as something of this nature. Consequently, the "Moment" through which history must be negated is to be found neither in the aspect of history as mere unity, nor in the aspect of history as mere contradiction. It lies in the fundamental structure of history—unity which is none other than contradiction.

In the fact that unity and contradiction are mutually contradictory resides the ultimate contradiction of history itself. This ultimate contradiction is not an 'ultimate contradiction' in the sense of a "Moment" wherein history arises, as is maintained in the philosophy of history. It is an ultimate contradiction in the sense of the negating "Moment" of history through which history itself is negated. This is the ultimate contradiction of history itself—its ultimate crisis, its ultimate inconstancy, its ultimate dilemma, and its ultimate anguish. Again, herein resides the ultimate criticism of history itself. This ultimate criticism is not merely something made from

an external standpoint; it must be the total, fundamentally subjective criticism of history itself.

The Buddhist parable concerning the venomous snakes and the robbers, from the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*,[21] and the story of the two rivers, by Shan-tao,[22] are good examples of this fundamentally subjective criticism. When religion regards the world as ultimately inconstant, ultimately false, ultimately evil, ultimately defiled, or enmeshed in original sin—and when it is held that this is inevitably the case—this attitude must by all means derive from the view of history just described. It must not derive from a mere rendering ultimate, in a sentimental or panic-stricken manner, of inconstancy or the contradictions of actuality.

To live in history without being aware of the abyss of this ultimate contradiction, which lies in the foundation of history itself, is just as if one were to hold a thousand-ton bomb and stare down into a ten-thousand-foot pit. To live in history so as to affirm it, contenting oneself with seeking solutions to the relative contradictions of history and thus achieving a unity, must be called so relaxed and superficial an approach that the contradiction at the root of history will surely not be resolved, and the efforts to resolve the branch contradictions of history will not be entirely successful. This explains why contradiction is irresolvable within the historical dialectic, and it explains the necessity of advancing to what may be called the "religious dialectic."

The term "religious dialectic" refers to that which overcomes the ultimate contradiction of history itself, the contradiction which is contained in the depths of history, though history does not confront it, and which, consequently, the historical dialectic can never entirely resolve. Thus, the religious dialectic goes beyond the abyss of history, and extricates itself from history, which, pervaded with ultimate anxiety, is constructed over the abyss.

What is called religious "salvation" or "emancipation" must mean, not merely the removal of the particular contradictions and anxieties of history, but this "casting off" achieved through the religious dialectic. This "casting off" must be none other than the ultimate, total elucidation which

---

[21] 雑阿含経 *Zō-agon-gyō* 43 (*Taishō* 2.313; no. 1172). For an English translation of the Pali source, see "The Snake" (chapter xxxv), *The Book of Kindred Sayings* (London; Pali Text Society, 1927), volume IV, pp. 107–110.

[22] 善導 (j., Zendō; *d.* 681). Cf. D. T. Suzuki (trans.), *The Kyōgyōshinshō* (Kyoto, 1974), pp. 99–100.

was referred to previously. Ultimate, total elucidation is not *merely* historical, subjective elucidation; it means confronting the ultimate contradiction of this historical, subjective elucidation, in other words, confronting the abyss of history. It means that history, as abyss and ultimate contradiction, dissolves itself, dies to itself (the Great Death), and casts itself off totally, in a fundamentally subjective manner. This is the ultimate "overcoming," the ultimate unification.

What is referred to as the "Great doubt block" is certainly not simply an intellectual doubt, nor is it a particular, relative, subjective "task" in history. It is ultimately contradictory, subjective history itself. Apart from the self-dissolution of this subject of history, apart from the "casting off" of history itself, there is no breaking up of the "Great doubt block," that is, no "Great Awakening." It is for this reason that the Great doubt block must be the total, fundamentally subjective task, and that Great Awakening must be total, fundamentally subjective elucidation, fundamentally subjective knowledge. The Great doubt block does not resemble an Idea which, as task, is to be solved by history's *living* history; it is, on the contrary, the ultimate contradictoriness of the subject of history itself. This is a supra-historical task which history is unable to elucidate in history. Elucidation of this task is nothing other than the "casting off" and self-dissolution of the subject of history, which ceaselessly and without limit faces the abyss of its own ultimate contradiction. Thus the subject of history goes beyond this abyss, freeing itself with the emergence of the Self-abiding, unhindered fundamental subject which has cut off all contradictions with a single cutting.

When we speak of the Great Way that reaches every quarter and opens out on all sides without hindrance,[23] this means precisely the fundamental subject which, having died, returns to life. That path which lies outside he who treads it is not the Great Way; that 'fundamental subject' which treads a path that lies outside itself is hardly worthy to be called the fundamental subject. Wherever this fundamental subject treads, without exception, is the Way. This is called the Great Way. For this fundamental subject, there is no particular path to be followed as the Way—thus it is called the Way Without Way. Only in this sense can the Way be that Great Self-abiding Way, in which one goes if one wants to go, and sits if one wants to sit. It is this that is Nan-ch'üan's Way; his "Ordinary Mind"

[23] Cf. note 16.

must be this fundamental subject. Herein there is no longer any Way apart from the Mind, no Mind apart from the Way. Mind and Way are one; there is nothing further the Mind need strive to attain. If there were, outside the fundamental subject, a path to be treaded by the fundamental subject or something to be sought by the fundamental subject, then there would be that which the Mind need strive to attain. But as Nan-ch'üan said, "If you seek after it, you fall away from it."[24] If there is nothing to strive to attain, then, as Wu-men comments in verse, "Nothing idle weighs heavy on the mind." "In spring, flowers; in summer, the cool breeze; in autumn, the moon; in winter, snow"—just as they are.[25] This is the Great Way, apart from which there is no Buddha for one to seek, no Pure Land to be attained. Our ordinariness is itself the Buddha Way, the Pure Land.

The casting off and self-dissolution of the ultimately contradictory subject of history and its freeing of itself with the emergence of the unhindered, Self-abiding, fundamental subject, is not achieved in the movement of history, that is, through the historical dialectic. It is accomplished at the root-source of history, which is prior to the birth of history. In living in history itself there is an ultimate contradiction, and thus, this ultimate contradiction cannot be resolved by means of living in history. It can only be resolved through the self-dissolution of history itself. Therefore, though the term 'the casting off and self-dissolution of history' has been used, this means that history "casts itself off" and returns to what it is prior to its own birth. Similarly, when the phrase, 'the freeing of the fundamental subject with the emergence of unhindered, Self-abiding, fundamental subject,' is employed, this must mean that the fundamental subject of history casts itself off and returns to the root-source fundamental subjectivity that is prior to the birth of history. Only in this way, without either ascending into heaven or attaining rebirth in the Pure Land, can the fundamental subject, which has cast itself off and emerged as the unhindered, Self-abiding, fundamental subject, restore to history, as the root-source fundamental subject of history, the ultimate unity which is original to history. Again, as the root-source fundamental subject of history, this unhindered, Self-abiding, fundamental subject can make history into the

---

[24] Cf. note 16.

[25] *Wu-men-kuan*, no. 19. These are Wu-men Hui-kai's (j., Mumon Ekai; *d.* 1260) comments upon Nan-ch'üan's remark. Cf. note 14.

wondrous form of the root-source fundamental subject, and lend to *living* in history its wondrous activity.

The True Buddha, as is spoken of in Buddhism, is none other than this root-source fundamental subject. The true Buddha Land is none other than that historical world in which the fundamental subject *is* this root-source fundamental subject. What Nan-ch'üan means by "Ordinary Mind" is this root-source fundamental subject sporting in samadhi (遊戯三昧 *yugezammai*) throughout the historical world. The Zen master Ta-sui Fa-chen, when asked by a monk, "When your life-and-death comes to you, what will you do?" replied, "Coming to tea, I take tea; coming to a meal, I take a meal." This single utterance, one could certainly say, well expresses the depths of ordinariness of this root-source fundamental subject of Ta-sui, which had gone beyond the abyss of ultimate contradiction.

TRANSLATED BY TOKIWA GISHIN
AND HOWARD CURTIS